

Douglas

WASHINGTON STAR

Approved For Release 2002/05/07 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000600010005-6

16 DEC 1970

Douglas Cautioned Bosch About Man With Link to CIA

By LYLE DENNISTON

Star Staff Writer

Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas took special steps in 1966 to warn Latin American political figure Juan Bosch not to deal with a man Douglas believed to be on the Central Intelligence Agency payroll.

The incident, disclosed in still-unpublished letters, was a sequel to a CIA mystery uncovered but not solved by a special House Judiciary subcommittee in its investigation of Douglas' out-of-court activity.

Release today of the subcommittee's 924-page report brought a wide array of disclosures about Douglas. Earlier, the panel had concluded — by a party-line vote of 3 to 1 — that none of its findings justified impeachment.

The panel report still has not been considered by the parent Judiciary Committee, and aides said the earliest that could be done would be next Tuesday.

Among all the disclosures, only one is left in an uncertain state in the report: The suggestion that the CIA was involved somehow in secret maneuvering in the Dominican Republic in the early 1960s, and that Douglas may have had at least an indirect role.

The subcommittee says it could not get full details because the CIA did not make a "satisfactory response" to its inquiries.

It is not clear, from documents in the report, whether Douglas knew at the time that the agency was in any way involved with a project to teach Dominican Republic adults, via television, to read and write.

That project was partly financed by the Albert Parvin Foundation, which Douglas headed as president from 1961 to 1963. Other financing came from the State Department, and the project apparently had strong White House support in the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

It has been learned that the subcommittee has in its files though it did not put them in its report letters which showed that, by 1963, Douglas had become aware of a possible CIA connection, and this is what

Warned Bosch in 1966

In 1966, Bosch was trying to return to leadership in the Dominican Republic. Justice Douglas, apparently aware by then of Volman's background, sought to warn Bosch about him.

On May 23, 1963, Douglas wrote a letter to another old friend, former Puerto Rico Gov. Luis Munoz Marin. Saying he did not trust communications in the Dominican Republic, the justice asked Munoz Marin to relay a "message" to Bosch.

Referring to the earlier Bosch-Volman association, Douglas wrote: "I am sure he (Bosch) did not know that Volman at the time was on the CIA payroll. Volman may or may not be at the present time, but I would think the chances are great that he is."

On May 31, Munoz Marin wrote back, advising Douglas that he would get word to Bosch of "the situation."

Besides writing to Munoz Marin, Douglas had conveyed his thoughts about Volman to Albert B. Parvin, the Los Angeles businessman who founded the Parvin Foundation in 1961 and asked Douglas to head it.

"Sacha Volman is back in the State Department or somebody's payroll, probably the CIA," Douglas wrote to Parvin on May 25, 1965. Recalling what he described as a "bitter experience" with Volman's handling of the literacy project, Douglas said the foundation would "not want to get tied up with him again."

These letters are not mentioned in the subcommittee report. However, the report does include materials showing that Douglas was personally involved with the literacy project and other political and economic activities in the Dominican Republic.

Prior to the coup that overthrown Bosch's government, a new constitution was written for the Dominican Republic. Letters in the subcommittee report show that Douglas has acted as an adviser to the assembly which drafted that document. He acknowledged this in a letter dated June 18, 1963, to a Dominican government leader.

Douglas also gave advice, relayed in a letter to Volman on April 11, 1963, on a contract affecting construction of dams and other economic development projects in the Dominican.

Discussed Foreign Affairs

But, according to the subcommittee report, the justice did not limit his advice to foreign affairs. Activities to those of the Dominican Republic.

A letter written by Douglas on June 9, 1966, reveals that he spent three hours the night before discussing Asian affairs and the Vietnam war with President Lyndon Johnson.

Douglas says he got Johnson's approval for an international conference — partly financed by the Parvin Foundation, and managed by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, which Douglas also headed — that would attempt to get both Red China and North Vietnam to talk over Asian problems with Western government and private leaders.

During the conversation with Johnson, Douglas relates, an hour and a half was taken up when Johnson "held on various aspects of Viet Nam, which I will not summarize at this time. He did, however give me a very simple recipe for resolving the Vietnam controversy."

That "recipe" is not described in the letter or the subcommittee report.

Among other reasons Douglas had for seeing Johnson, he indicated, was to get the President's clearance for a visit to Hanoi by two Americans — Harry Ashmore and William Baggs — to talk to Ho Chi Minh, the North Vietnamese leader, about attending the Asian conference.

Other Disclosures

The subcommittee report, besides detailing these activities involving Douglas, also contains these other disclosures:

• In the years 1960-69, Douglas earned more from off-bench activity than from his Supreme Court salary. His total salary was \$339,749.26 while his non-court income was \$473,940.19.

• Of his outside income, Douglas received \$36,600 for his service as president of the Parvin Foundation, and \$377,269.19 from "writing and lecturing," according to the justice's income tax returns. Another document in the report shows the foundation paid him \$101,000, plus \$765.23. There is no explanation of the differing figures. Still another shows that the part of his income which came from the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions was \$10,350 in honorariums and \$13,770.46 in reimbursed expenses.

• The report shows that Douglas' ties with Albert Parvin extended well beyond the Parvin Foundation. Documents show that Parvin's furnishings supply company sold the Douglasses a total of \$3,350.23 worth of furniture and other items for their vacation home in Goose Prairie, Wash., that Parvin sent to the

Approved For Release 2002/05/07 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000600010005-6

Douglas a barbecue for which Parvin apparently paid, that Parvin sent to them a "portable bar," that he sent to Mrs. Cathy Douglas some silverware which he apparently obtained at a discount, and that Douglas asked him to do some Christmas shopping in Los Angeles for Douglas' son and two grandchildren in 1967.

• The subcommittee, in examining an Internal Revenue Service criminal investigation of Parvin from 1964 to 1967, when it was decided no charges would be brought, found that 41 federal agents spent 30,617 man-hours, obtained about 300,000 documents, examined 200 tax returns, and pursued their inquiry into eight states and the District. The probe, which ultimately reached beyond Parvin to the foundation, his business firm, and his former partner, Harry A. Goldman, was closed April 21, 1967. However, civil audit investigations apparently continue at IRS, along with a study of whether the Parvin Foundation should lose its tax exemption.

• Another revelation in the report is that Douglas' handling of a group of Supreme Court appeals by military reservists trying to avoid going to Vietnam so angered Rep. Edward Hebert, D-La., that he asked the Justice

Department to demand that Douglas disqualify himself from a key test case on the military draft. Solicitor Gen. Erwin N. Griswold turned down the idea Sept. 2, 1969.

• The subcommittee report quotes Douglas letters accusing the FBI of leaking to the press the fact that the Parvin Foundation got its funds from a mortgage on a Las Vegas gambling casino. In an Oct. 17, 1963, letter he said the FBI was trying to "drive me out" of a then-pending Supreme Court case involving FBI eavesdropping on Fred B. Black Jr., an associate of former Senate Democratic Secretary Robert G. (Bobby) Baker.

No Basis for Charges Found

Over-all, the subcommittee report finds no basis for any of the charges leveled against Douglas by House Minority Leader Gerald Ford, R-Mich., or others who have suggested that the justice be impeached.

The panel specifically finds that Douglas has broken no law by his activities, because it says he did not practice law while on the bench, and it refutes, among others, the charges that Douglas had association with gamblers and organized crime figures, that he took part in two Supreme Court cases in which Parvin had an interest, that he used his influence to help an immigrant

with his problems with immigration authorities, and that he advocated violent revolution in his latest book.

In releasing the report yesterday, Rep. Emanuel Celler, D-N.Y., the subcommittee chairman, said he was "sure all fair-minded people . . . will agree that there is no basis for impeachment of Associate Justice Douglas."

He rejected the suggestion by Douglas' critics that the subcommittee must hold some hearings to get testimony under oath, saying this would be "an exercise in futility" because the evidence available from documents and interviews "is not contradicted."

Although noting that only three subcommittee members voted for the final report, Celler said none of the five members "would assert that there is a basis for impeachment. Should we strain to dredge all of the Seven Seas?"

Cites Lack of Questioning

The lone dissenter from the report, Rep. Edward Hutchinson, R-Mich., complained that none of the evidence had been tested "in the crucible of cross-examination."

In addition, he said the subcommittee should have gone be-

yond its search for evidence of conduct that would justify impeachment, to see if there was an "appearance of impropriety" that might merit "congressional censure or other official criticism in the House."

Rep. Ford, who is not a member of the subcommittee, issued his own statement accusing the panel of a "whitewash," and arguing that "only an excess of personal or partisan loyalty or a failure fully to study the documents can explain an attempt to close the case at this point."

The GOP leader said he would join others in trying to get an independent investigation — outside the Judiciary Committee — in the new Congress.